contemporary art and its commercial markets a report on current conditions and future scenarios

maria lind, olav velthuis (eds.)

术与
济

SternbergPress

edited by
maria lind, olav velthuis

contributions by
stefano baia curioni
karen van den berg/ursula pasero
isabelle graw
goldin+senneby
noah horowitz
suhail malik/andrea phillips
alain quemin
olav velthuis

published by sternberg press
and tensta konsthall

ISBN 978-1-934105-99-3

9 781934 105993

Contemporary Art and Its Commercial Markets: A Report on Current Conditions and Future Scenarios

Editors: Maria Lind, Olav Velthuis
Copy editor: Joy Beecroft
Design: Metahaven
Chinese translation (cover): Ming Bai
Printing: Brandenburgische Universitätsdruckerei Potsdam
Paper: Munken Pure, Trucard 1 gloss
Set in: Berthold Akzidenz Grotesk, Folio, Granjon

ISBN 978-1-934105-99-3

Tensta konsthall
Taxingegränd 10
S-163 04 Spånga
www.tenstakonsthall.se

Sternberg Press
Caroline Schneider
Karl-Marx-Allee 78
D-10243 Berlin
www.sternberg-press.com

colophon

the internationalization of the contemporary art world and market: the role of nationality and territory in a supposedly "globalized" sector

alain quemin

Since the end of the 1960s, the international art trade has to a large extent been integrated into a world market, the *very heart* of which is constituted by international exchanges, and the main contemporary art institutions, including museums and art centers, have been part of a vast international network.[1] The various actors on this scene often state that they consider geographical boundaries and nationalities, including those of the artists, to be negligible. Such a notion, which no doubt one would always find to be the majority view in the world of contemporary art (which in essence seems so obviously international, since, today, validation by space, by geographical distance, has replaced the validation by time characteristic of art in the past), has no doubt been reinforced by the current situation. Globalization, cultural mixing, and

the questioning of the traditional frontiers and hierarchies between forms of artistic expression are all part of the zeitgeist, and extend well beyond contemporary art. This discourse has been spreading in the art world for about twenty years now, especially since the major exhibition held in Paris in 1989 "Les magiciens de la terre" (The Wizards of Planet Earth). The 2001 Venice Biennale was titled "Plateau of Humankind," no less. The theme of documenta 11, held in Kassel in 2002, centered on the different world cultures, on the peripheral zones and the position of the artist in today's world. Since the beginning of the 2000s, globalization in the art world has been taken for granted so often that it is less regularly asserted now.

However, even if the actors on the international contemporary art scene are convinced that this planetary creative effervescence is a reality, along with the concomitant exchanges, and while they may often prove ardent upholders of the deepest cultural relativism by arguing that no country can claim greater artistic importance than any other, and that all this is a matter of talent and individual personality, it is also true that, paradoxically but imperturbably, they also often recognize the existence of a hierarchy of countries, a ranking that is familiar to all and is part of the world of contemporary art.[2]

If we go beyond the initial discourse, indicators reveal that there is indeed such a ranking of the countries involved in the world of contemporary art, a ranking in terms of both institutions and the market, which tends to contradict the discourse on so-called globalization.

how international really is the art world today? measuring it with the kunstkompass

When analyzing the hangings of the permanent collections in a number of the main international institutions, such as MoMA in New York City, Tate Modern in London, Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris, or the Hamburger Bahnhof in Berlin, a strikingly high proportion of national artists is evident, as well as a concentration on American artists, generally followed by German and British ones, then French and Italian.[3] A similar tendency can be observed at the biggest and most prestigious art events, such as the major biennials, among them, the Venice Biennale.[4]

The "Kunstkompass," which ranks artists in terms of institutional recognition, can synthetize artists' international visibility.[5] It is based on solo shows and artists' participations in group hangings at the most prominent venues, and on their coverage in the main contemporary art publications. This ranking of the 100 most recognized artists has been published almost annually by German journals since 1970—first by *Capital,* and more recently by *Manager Magazin.* We can thus analyze the evolution of the different countries' positions over a considerable period in order to see which are the long-term leaders, how the ranking has evolved, and which new challengers have emerged. As Raymonde Moulin emphasizes in *L'artiste, l'institution et le marché,* the aim of the creator of the Kunstkompass, Willi Bongard, was to establish a scale for measuring artists' reputations, based on the rough

assumption that this was an objective measure of their aesthetic value.[6] An artist's rank in this classification is the result not of their prices on the contemporary art market but of a set of judgments made by contemporary art "experts."[7] Raymonde Moulin notes that the weighting system established by Bongard, and refined by the collaborators who continued the system after his death in 1985, is not unrelated to the very honorable position held by German artists in this ranking. That said, whatever criticisms may have been made of the Kunstkompass as an instrument, the publication of the results obtained by Bongard and his successors has always had the effect of a *self-fulfilling prophecy*. Moreover, while one can certainly criticize the overrepresentation of Germany in the construction of this indicator and, accordingly, of German artists in the resulting table (as well as of certain major neighboring countries),[8] the *evolution* of the countries' respective positions within this ranking is less open to debate, since it introduces much less bias.

As was mentioned earlier, the Kunstkompass takes the form of a ranking. The hundred best-known and esteemed artists are ranked in descending order of renown. In 2010, the rank of each artist for that year was followed by their rank in 2009 and then by their name, year of birth, country, main discipline (painting, sculpture, video, installation, conceptual art, land art, etc.), the total number of points obtained, and other indications concerning, notably, the average price of a work, but also the artist's gallery.

In all, only twenty countries were represented in 2010 and in very unequal proportions: 29 artists were American and 29 were German, 13 were British, 4

were French and 4 were Swiss, 3 were Austrian, 2 were Italian, 2 were Belgian, 2 were Danish and 2 were Canadian. Ten other countries appeared in the ranking with only one artist each: The Netherlands, Greece, Serbia, Russia, South Africa, Iran, Mexico, Japan, Thailand, and India. It should be underlined that, although globalization is supposed to rule the contemporary art world today, national concentration is extremely strong and the West is clearly dominant when it comes to the most visible artists on the international art scene. And, while in terms of nationality, the artists featured in the Kunstkompass only represent a very limited number of countries, if we were to take into account each artist's country or (in a very few cases) countries of residence, the apparent diversity that could be suggested by taking the passport factor into account would drastically diminish. Moreover, this would significantly heighten the prominence of the Western countries, especially the United States.

In order to further compare the positions of the different countries in 2010, we have added up the number of points accumulated by all the artists of a given country, and calculated the percentage of points per country. This helps bring out the position of each country in terms of the artists represented in the ranking.

diagram 1. share of each country in the kunstkompass in 2010

Except for the bias in favor of German artists, this ranking of countries is very similar to what we can observe in the most important museums or biennials. It, too, brings out the overwhelming dominance

of American and German artists on the international contemporary art scene and, more generally, the dominance of Western countries.

II

the limited progress of globalization as reflected by the kunstkompass

We can also compare the yearly evolution of the number of artists per country for the top 100 countries in the Kunstkompass. This, of course, somewhat broadens the scope to other countries. The result thus obtained is presented in diagram 2.

diagram 2. number of artists per country in the kunstkompass

From diagram 2 it can be seen that, while the United States has continued to dominate the rankings in terms of the number of artists, its position has nevertheless slipped. Still, this is only due to the fact that the Kunstkompass defines the countries of the artists in terms of passport. If country of residence were considered, most artists that appear in the ranking as nationals of minor or peripheral countries would prove to live in the United States, and the share of this country would literally jump.[9] Germany's presence grew solidly during the 1980s and continues to gain prominence. In contrast, the United Kingdom's position slipped in relation to its position in the late 1970s, before its presence increased again recently. Belgium, which disappeared for a while from the list of the 100 most recognized artists, has re-entered it.

Switzerland seems fairly stable, while the French and Italian positions have been eroded.

We may also note the disappearance of several countries from outside the Western world. These countries seem particularly vulnerable, in that they are each represented by a single artist. However, between the Kunstkompass of 1970 and that of 2010, a dozen new countries outside the Western European and North American ambit have produced artists who have entered the table—more than have slipped out of it.

If, in both 2005 and 2000, the 100 artists enjoying greatest international recognition were concentrated in twenty-two countries, it should be noted that in 1979, and even in 1997, they represented only fourteen countries. Recent years have therefore seen a diversification in the geographical origins of the most recognized artists,[10] which clearly illustrates the phenomenon of multiculturalism. Still, in 2010, the number of countries represented in the ranking dropped to only twenty. That said, in 2005, ninety of the ranked artists still came from countries of Western Europe or North America (in 2000, the figure was eighty-eight); but in 2010, the number increased again to ninety-two, and while this still represents a decrease since 1979, when there were ninety-five, it clearly shows the overwhelming dominance of these two geographical ensembles when it comes to the most recognized contemporary art.

We have just considered the yearly development of the figures for the number of artists per country. But what picture do we get if we consider the evolution over fifteen years of the percentage of the total

number of points attributed to each country via nationals appearing in the Kunstkompass top 100? This indicator allows us to consider not only the number of artists per country, but also their ranking, and the number of points obtained by each one.

diagram 3. evolution of the shares of countries in the kunstkompass

Analysis of the points for 1995 reveals the tremendous prominence of the United States, which accounts for over 40% of the points attributed to the top 100 artists. Germany also plays a very important role, with nearly 30% of the total points in the indicator. A long way behind these two countries, which appear to be the clear leaders on the international art scene, come three others—the United Kingdom, France, and Italy—whose artistic recognition is relatively modest. The shares of the countries further down the ranking seem more insignificant, insofar as most of them are present through having only one artist in the Kunstkompass.

In the evolution of the respective positions over the last fifteen years we can observe a number of medium-term trends. As we have already pointed out—and we have found traces of this phenomenon when looking at other indicators—even if the United States is still very much number one in the international world of contemporary art, and while it constitutes its center, its position, falsely, seems to have become more fragile in the last few years as its national scene has integrated many foreign artists. Thus, after 1998, the total points share of American artists in the Kunstkompass dipped below 40%, and it has

now slipped to around 31%. In contrast, Germany has maintained its share over the same period at around 30%.

The United Kingdom, surfing on the wave of the Young British Artists, has seen its position improve significantly (from 5.7 to 10.7%) and is now well ahead of countries, such as France, that were very much within touching distance in 1995. The gap between these two countries has in fact widened in both directions, since France has slipped markedly, going from 5.9% in 1995 to 3.7% in 2010. Italy, too, has slipped markedly, falling from 4.6% to 2.0% between 1995 and 2010.

Austria's position has improved, so that it is now higher than Italy, and so has that of Switzerland, whose share increased from 1.5% in 1995 to 3.7% in 2010. Belgium, whose share collapsed for a few years, when it disappeared from the table, has since made a notable comeback.

All the other countries concerned are makeweights in the Kunstkompass. While it may be true that the number of countries represented in diagram 3 has risen in the last fifteen years, all but those mentioned above occupy only minor positions on the scale showing the limits of globalization.

Although constantly ignored or denied by the members of the art world, the weight of the nationality factor is nevertheless clearly perceptible and we can make out a recurrent opposition between a "center," a "semi-periphery," and a "periphery." The center clearly comprises the United States, or possibly the United States and Germany (if we decide to ignore the bias in favor of Germany), the semi-periphery comprises

countries like the United Kingdom, France, Italy, or Switzerland; the periphery, all other countries.

III

the hierarchy of countries revealed by the market

Territorial concentrations and a hierarchy of countries can also clearly be seen in both segments that constitute the art market, public sales at auctions on the one hand and private sales in galleries on the other.

The data published yearly by Artprice shows extreme concentration phenomena on the auction market.[11] The repartition of fine art sales was extremely concentrated in 2010 as only three countries held just over 80% of all fine art auctions, with a share of 33% for China, 30% for the US, 19% for the UK, 5% for France, and the rest of the world sharing the remaining 13%! In just a few years, the rise of China on the auction market has been spectacular. It reached third place in 2007 and totally upset the traditional ranking that was until then reproduced each year, with the United States coming first, far in front of the United Kingdom, which occupied a very comfortable second position in front of France. In 2009, only four countries held just over 80% of all fine art auctions: 27.9% US, 21.3% UK, 17.4% China, and 13.9% France, followed by Italy and Germany, which only held 3.2% of all auctions each.[12]

diagram 4. contemporary art: the top 10 auction houses in the world 2010/2011

Although two Western auctioneers, Christie's and Sotheby's, are still, by far, the world leaders, seven out of the ten most important auction houses are now Chinese. China's domination of today's contemporary art market is spectacular; it holds a far more important share of the market than the United States: for the period from July 2010 to June 2011, turnover reached €390 million in China, €227 million in the US, €177 million in the UK, and €20 million in France. If the €9 million made in Taiwan and the €7 million made in Singapore are added to the Chinese results, Asia's share represents more than half the turnover of contemporary art auctions in the world.[13]

China's boom in the auction field and especially in the contemporary art sector is mostly due to the fact that Chinese collectors and investors, who are often relatively young (less than 50 years of age), are eager to buy works by contemporary Chinese artists, especially for reasons of social prestige. This pushes the prices of Chinese contemporary artists at auction to record highs. Although the highest prices at contemporary art auctions were traditionally made by American artists, and then by British and German artists,[14] half of the top ten contemporary artists selling work at auction are now Chinese. Most of these Chinese artists are sold at auctions organized in China, and production is oriented toward Chinese buyers. It seems that only Chinese buyers are ready to hand over high sums for works by artists who are not equally supported by the most prestigious contemporary art institutions (who all happen to be located in the Western world), which might be because the Chinese are less conscious of the importance of

institutional support to guarantee valuation of contemporary works in the long term; that they are culturally less afraid of gambling; or that they are sure enough of the durability of their prosperity and of the competition between national buyers for Chinese works of art, to be able to guarantee extremely high prices in the medium and long terms.

Sales in galleries tend to obey a different logic than at auctions. One of the ways to study the role played by territory and nationality in the gallery sales segment is through art fairs and gallery participation by country. The socio-scientific literature on art markets, so far, has largely ignored the role of art galleries at international contemporary art fairs.[15] One reason for this omission is probably the privacy with which art galleries treat their transactions, which has made it difficult for researchers to obtain data on these sales. Some recent studies are, however, starting to counteract this trend.[16] These studies are especially welcome given that participation at art fairs generates a major source of income for art galleries.[17] Besides, they also provide a means of comparing the operations of different art market sectors: the territorial dynamics of international contemporary art fairs with those of auction houses.

The national profiles of participating galleries at Art Basel, the most prestigious international art fair in the world, are exemplary in this regard: only 10% of exhibiting galleries are Swiss, whilst 23% are from the US, 17% are German, 10% are from the UK, 8% are French, and 7% are Italian. Although this example shows little national diversity given the small number of countries that each gallery represents, it is still the

case that Art Basel is truly international insofar as these countries are the most prestigious in art world terms and clearly are leading nations in the field.

With the help of data provided by Artprice, we identified all international contemporary art fairs held worldwide in 2008 and specialized in "contemporary" art. We then set up a selection criteria to include only those art fairs that featured (i) a significant number of foreign exhibitors; and (ii) galleries of sufficiently diversified nationality, in order to identify those fairs that exhibit an international dimension, and to determine how truly "international" this dimension is. The application of these criteria led us to exclude about twenty fairs from the initial population data of art fairs with any degree of extra-national visibility. The double criteria were systematically applied to those art fairs with the largest number of exhibitors and held in Western countries that dominate the international art scene, that is, the US, Germany, the UK, and France, amongst a few others. However, we were a little more lax when applying the criteria to the often smaller-scale art fairs held in more peripheral countries,[18] such as Abu Dhabi and China, in order to make the range of art galleries included in our population as geographically diverse as possible.[19]

diagram 5. forty-one international contemporary art fairs

diagram 6. breakdown of contemporary art fairs by organizing country in 2008

As can be seen from diagrams 5 and 6 the United States hosts the lion's share (24.4%) of the art fairs selected in our population (including the renowned

Art Basel Miami, New York Armory Show, and Art Chicago). Second place is occupied by Switzerland, which organizes Art Basel; Italy, host to international art fairs in Turin, Milan, and Bologna; and China, which has managed to become a key art market country for auctions within the last few years.[20] Each of the three aforementioned countries hosts around 7% of international art fairs. In joint third place are Germany (Cologne and Berlin),[21] France (FIAC), the Netherlands, and two peripheral countries in art market terms,[22] Australia and the United Arab Emirates.[23] Australia benefits from its relative geographical isolation from major international art market hubs, while the United Arab Emirates has recently pursued an active policy of promoting both art and the art market. These countries are followed by twelve others, each of which organizes just one significant international contemporary art fair; *inter alia* the UK (Frieze Art Fair)—despite being a key international art market player itself,[24] especially for auctions. The other countries are Belgium, Austria, Spain, Portugal, Russia, Canada, Mexico, Argentina, Japan, Taiwan, and Singapore. So while the world counts almost 200 countries in terms of distinct political units, international contemporary art fairs—those that may be considered to exhibit genuinely contemporary art—are hosted in a mere twenty-one of these countries. Even though international contemporary art fairs have spread to other parts of the globe, entire regions—and even whole continents such as Africa—are completely unrepresented, and most regions are represented only marginally.

So what can be said now about the countries of origin of the galleries participating in international

contemporary art fairs? The data produced by Artprice on our behalf has made it possible, for the first time, to calculate not only the *total number of gallery participations* at international fairs in 2008, at 4,113 (many galleries participate in more than one fair), but also to ascertain that the *number of different galleries* involved in this social world is around 2,300 (2,322 galleries to be exact).[25] The high number of galleries pertaining to the same country reinforces the previously noted concentration among a few countries and the uneven representation of these countries in the organization of art fairs.

diagram 7. contemporary art galleries participating in international fairs in 2008

As can be seen from diagram 7, in terms of the location (home country) of galleries participating at international contemporary art fairs the United States (20.0% of galleries) is far ahead of its usual challenger Germany (11.3%),[26] which is once again the leader of a small group of mostly Western countries. Italy comes behind with 9.4% of participating galleries but benefits from an over-representation at international fairs held in Italy. Next comes France (6.4%), closely followed by Australia (6.2%), which tends to control its own domestic market, due largely to its physical distance from the major international contemporary art market hubs. The same could be said of Japan (4.9%). Spain (4.3%) comes in slightly ahead of the United Kingdom (4.1%), which remains a big player in terms of contemporary art sales at auctions but does not do as well in terms of participating at international

contemporary art fairs. These are followed by the Netherlands (3.8%),[27] Canada (3.1%), and Switzerland, which despite accounting for only 2.8% of the total, houses some of the world's largest and most internationally active art galleries.

Not only are the locations of international contemporary art fairs limited to a very small geographical, and mainly Western, space, but the participating galleries come from just sixty-four Western countries, that is, one-third of the world's nations. The US, Germany, the UK, Italy, France, and Spain send no less than 55.5% of participating galleries: the US accounts for 20% while the five major European Union countries account for 35.5%.[28] Australia (6.2%) and Japan (4.9%) have taken advantage of their physical distance from major international contemporary art market hubs and major international galleries to exercise a large measure of control over their domestic markets. The remarkable strides made by Chinese artists in terms of contemporary art auction sales (in just a few years) do not translate into an increased presence of Chinese art galleries at international contemporary art fairs, where they represent only 2.6% of participants. Even so, while these figures are indeed modest, Chinese galleries are already well ahead of other emerging economies such as Brazil (1.0%), India, or the Russian Federation (with 0.7% each).

It must be pointed out that apart from those countries already mentioned, very few account for more than 1% of participating galleries at international contemporary art fairs; Western, and more specifically, European countries continue to have the strongest presence (3.8% Canada, 2.8% Switzerland, 2.1%

Belgium, 2.0% Austria, and 1.5% Portugal). Non-European and non-Western countries send a lower proportion of participating galleries: 1.9% Taiwan, 1.7% South Korea, 1.7% Argentina, and 1.1% Singapore. Despite being a major world country Brazil only represents 1% of all galleries; and forty-four other countries send less than 1% of galleries. Once again, in terms of geographical location, the concentration of galleries is extremely marked.

IV

the recurring division of the international art world into center and periphery

A recurring theme in the debate over the specific dynamics of cultural globalization is whether this phenomenon maintains or generates forms of inequality, and if so, what kind.[29] One line of argument is represented by the analyses of Sassen and Bauman,[30] which suggest that under the conditions of globalization, national borders are being increasingly erased and substituted with growing fluxes or international exchanges and, compared to other sociologists, such as those working within a Marxist tradition,[31] pay little attention to unequal exchange and national forms of domination. A second line of argument explains how the global is structured more around patterns of flows than around pre-constituted entities: Castells refers to flows rather than organizations, while Scholte emphasizes deterritorialization as characteristic of globalization, by stating that the increase of flows make national entities less significant.[32]

Given our results, a line of analysis of particular relevance is that represented by the works of Wallerstein and Bourdieu and Wacquant, which point to an imbalance in international cultural exchanges and to the existence of domination effects.[33] Wallerstein makes this point by arguing that transnational cultural exchanges merely reflect the contradictions and imbalances in the world economy, where a few Western economies dominate the rest of the world. However, for Bourdieu, Heilbron, and Sapiro, the cultural sphere exhibits a certain form of autonomy from the economic sphere, something which is seen, for example, in the forms of transnational cultural exchanges affecting the fields of literature and translations.[34] This school of thought uses quantitative data to highlight both the fact that "Imbalances ... characterize the very structure of international exchange," and that "instead of an equilibrium between import and export, the reality of transnational exchange is a process of uneven exchange."[35] The conclusion here is that cultural exchanges operate in relation to a clearly discernable geographical center, which is distinct from its periphery.

At a time supposedly characterized by the disappearance or weakening of national borders the reality revealed by the statistics presented here is a stark one.[36] A strong hierarchy of countries controls the organization of and participation in the international contemporary art world and market. Our data makes clear that national states still retain much of their power over the international art world and market, which remain highly territorialized and controlled by a few such national units. These findings lead us to endorse a definition of globalization, which, in spite of the intensifica-

tion of exchanges linked to this phenomenon, asserts the prominence of pre-existing geographical entities,[37] seen here in terms of the countries organizing the international contemporary art world and market.

conclusion

In spite of increasing internationalization, the different indicators that we have considered here make it quite clear that the territorial dimension certainly has not disappeared. Fashionable phenomena such as "globalization," mixing and cultural relativism, and the tremendous opening to other world cultures, touted in the world of contemporary art in recent years, are to a large extent illusory. Empirical data reveals that cultural globalization appears mostly as an increase in transnational exchanges that neither erase national borders nor the impact of national units. Although artistic events have spread around the globe, this has not led to a displacement of the most important zones, or even to any real sharing between center, semi-periphery, and periphery, the latter comprising all those countries that are not a part of the double geographical nucleus that, still today, is constituted by a few countries of Western Europe, on one side, and the United States on the other. Although we have considered the impact of territorial national units in this text, we could have also considered cities, and, had we done so, the role of New York would have been central. Today, although some—very limited—diversity seems to have occurred in terms of the nations that are present in the most competitive segment of the contemporary art scene, this is often only because artists migrate from all over

the world to try and succeed in New York City. It is highly probable that this phenomenon will go on and will even accelerate in the next decade, as the general tendency seems to be an increasing concentration of the process of artistic recognition through being a part of the American/New York City art scene. Today, globalization is nothing more than a mirage or a motto, and it will most probably stay the same for the next decade. On the opposite side, the evolution of the market, especially in the auction segment, seems less predictable. Over the last five years, the dramatic rise of China has introduced a real rupture in the world of auctions, and the hierarchy in this domain today is totally different from how it had been for many years. However, Chinese artists have not met a similar evolution in contemporary art institutions, and Chinese galleries have not known a similar breakthrough internationally. The rise of China on the auction scene was due to a dramatic economic development and the rise of a minority of super rich businessmen who turned to contemporary art buying, but also to their strong focus on national artists. It is therefore too early to say whether other fast developing countries such as India and Brazil will know similar evolutions. A similar development of the national economy and fortunes in Russia did not benefit the national art market or Russian artists, as Russian collectors mostly turned to American and British artists. But in this we see, once again, that national factors remain fundamental, even on a market and in a social world as supposedly "globalized" as those of contemporary art.

notes

1 Raymonde Moulin, *The French Art Market: A Sociological View; A Sociological Perspective* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1987). Originally published as *Le marché de la peinture en France* (Paris: Minuit, 1967).

2 Alain Quemin, *L'art contemporain international: Entre les institutions et le marché* (Nimes, Co-edition Jacqueline Chambon / Artprice, 2002); Alain Quemin, "Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts: An Empirical Survey of 'High Culture' and Globalization," *International Sociology* 21, no. 4 (December 2006): 522–550; Alain Quemin, "Montrer une collection internationale d'art contemporain: un ou plusieurs modèles? La place des différents pays sur les cimaises du Centre Georges Pompidou, de la Tate Modern, du MoMA et dans le monde international de l'art," in Anne-Solène Rolland and Hanna Murauskaya, *De nouveaux modèles de musées? Formes et enjeux des créations et rénovations de musées en Europe XIXe–XXIe siècles* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2008), 219–234; Alain Quemin, "International Contemporary Art Fairs and Galleries: An Exclusive Overview," in *Le marché de l'art contemporain: Contemporary Art Market 2007/2008: The Artprice Annual Report* (Saint-Romain-au-Mont-d'Or: Artprice, 2008): 78–88, http://imgpublic.artprice.com/pdf/fiac08en.pdf; Howard S. Becker, *Art Worlds* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

3 Quemin, *L'art contemporain international*; Quemin, "Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts"; Alain Quemin, "Montrer une collection internationale d'art contemporain: La place des différents pays sur les cimaises du Centre Pompidou," in *Centre Pompidou: 30 ans d'histoire* (Paris: Editions du centre Georges Pompidou, 2007), 527–535.

4 Quemin, *L'art contemporain international*; "Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts"; Quemin, "Montrer une collection internationale d'art contemporain"; Quemin, "International Contemporary Art Fairs and Galleries," 81–91; Femke van Hest (doctoral thesis in progress, on the international presence of Dutch artists, l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris and Erasmus Universiteit, Rotterdam).

5 Raymonde Moulin, *L'artiste, l'institution et le marché* (Paris, Flammarion, 1992); Quemin, *L'art contemporain international.*

6 Moulin, *L'artiste, l'institution et le marché.*

7 Pierre Bourdieu, "Le hit-parade des intellectuels français ou qui sera juge de la légitimité des juges ?," *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, nos. 52–53 (June 1984): 95–97.

8 Quemin, *L'art contemporain international*; Quemin, "Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts."

9 Quemin, "Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts."

10 We use the expression "geographical origin" advisedly, since many of the artists from the zones that are most peripheral to the world of contemporary art no longer live or work in their countries of origin. Likewise, few of them manage to attain the greatest degree of international renown without going through a "mainstream" Western gallery.

11 Artprice, *Le marché de l'art contemporain: Contemporary Art Market 2010/2011: The Artprice Annual Report* (Saint-Romain-au-Mont-d'Or: Artprice, 2011).

12 Artprice, *Art Market Trends / Tendances du marché de l'art* (Saint-Romain-au-Mont-d'Or: Artprice, 2009).

13 Artprice, *Le marché de l'art contemporain 2010/2011.*

14 Quemin, *L'art contemporain international.*

15 Moulin Raymonde, *Le marché de la peinture en France* (Paris, Minuit, 1967); Moulin, *L'artiste,*

— *l'institution et le marché.*

16 Olav Velthuis, "Symbolic Meanings of Prices: Constructing the Value of Contemporary Art in Amsterdam and New York Galleries," *Theory and Society* 32, no. 2 (April 2003): 181–215; David Halle and Elisabeth Tiso, "Lessons from Chelsea: A Study in Contemporary Art," *The International Journal of the Humanities* 3, no. 11 (2005): 45–66; Michael Hutter et al., "Two Games in Town: A Comparison of Dealer and Auction Prices in Contemporary Visual Arts Markets," *Journal of Cultural Economy* 31, no. 4 (2007): 247–261; Quemin, "International Contemporary Art Fairs and Galleries."

17 Marcel Fournier and Myrtille Roy-Valex, "Art contemporain et internationalisation: Les galeries québécoises et les foires," *Sociologie et Sociétés* 34, no. 2 (Autumn 2002): 41–62. Quemin, "International Contemporary Art Fairs and Galleries."

18 Johan Heilbron, "Towards a Sociology of Translation: Book Translations as a Cultural World-System," *European Journal of Social Theory* 2, no. 4 (1999): 429–444; Johan Heilbron, "Echanges culturels transnationaux et mondialisation: quelques réflexions," *Regards Sociologiques* 22 (2001): 141–154; Quemin, "Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts"; Gisèle Sapiro, ed., *Translatio: Le marché de la traduction en France à l'heure de la mondialisation* (Paris: CNRS Editions, 2008).

19 Quemin, "International Contemporary Art Fairs and Galleries."

20 It must be noted that Chinese art fairs were partially included in the population by adhering to the logic used to broaden the profiles of the actors represented.

21 Quemin, *L'art contemporain international*; Quemin, "Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts."

22 Heilbron, "Towards a Sociology of Translation"; Heilbron, "Echanges culturels transnationaux et mondialisation"; Quemin, "Globalization and

— Mixing in the Visual Arts."

23 These also reflect our wish to broaden the national profiles of our data population.

24 Quemin, *L'art contemporain international.*

25 Becker, *Art Worlds.*

26 Quemin, *L'art contemporain international*; Quemin, "Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts."

27 Femke van Hest (doctoral thesis in progress).

28 The European Union as a whole accounts for 43.1% of participating galleries and thus we can see that the influence of this economic and political entity is concentrated among just a handful of its members.

29 Göran Therborn, "From the Universal to the Global," *International Sociology* 15, no. 2 (June 2000): 149–150.

30 Saskia Sassen, *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996); Saskia Sassen, *Globalization and Its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money* (New York: New Press, 1999); Saskia Sassen, "Territory and Territoriality in the Global Economy," *International Sociology* 15, no. 2 (June 2000): 372–393; Zygmunt Bauman, *Globalization: The Human Consequences* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998).

31 Immanuel Wallerstein, *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World System* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; and Paris: Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, 1991); Immanuel Wallerstein, "The National and the Universal: Can There Be Such a Thing as World Culture?," in Anthony D. King, ed., *Culture, Globalization and the World System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000), 91–105.

32 Manuel Castells, *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring, and the Urban*

— *Regional Process* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991); Jan-Aart Scholte, "The Geography of Collective Identities in a Globalizing World," *Review of International Political Economy* 3, no. 4 (Winter 1996): 565–607.

33 Wallerstein, *Geopolitics and Geoculture*; Wallerstein, "The National and the Universal"; Pierre Bourdieu and Loic Wacquant, "On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason," *Theory, Culture and Society* 16, no. 1 (February 1999): 41–58.

34 Pierre Bourdieu, "Les conditions sociales de la circulation internationale des idées," *Romanische Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, no. 1/2 (1990): 1–10; Heilbron, "Towards a Sociology of Translation"; Heilbron, "Echanges culturels transnationaux et mondialisation."

35 Heilbron, "Towards a Sociology of Translation"; Heilbron, "Echanges culturels transnationaux et mondialisation"; Sapiro, *Translatio*; Heilbron, "Echanges culturels transnationaux et mondialisation," 146 and 149.

36 Sassen, *Losing Control?*; Sassen, *Globalization and Its Discontents*; Sassen, "Territory and Territoriality in the Global Economy."

37 Jan-Aart Scholte, "Global Capitalism and the State," *International Affairs* 73, no. 3 (1997): 427–452.

share of each country in the kunstkompass in 2010

Country	%
Germany	31.7
United States	31.2
United Kingdom	10.7
France	3.7
Switzerland	3.7
Austria	2.7
Denmark	2.1
Italy	2.0
Belgium	1.8
Canada	1.7
South Africa	1.4
Russia	1.1
Iran	1.0
Netherlands	0.9
Mexico	0.9
Greece	0.8
Serbia	0.8
Japan	0.7
Thailand	0.7
India	0.7

diagram 1

number of artists per country in the kunstkompass

Country	1979	1997	2000	2005	2010
United States	50	40	33	31	29
Germany	11	28	28	31	29
United Kingdom	12	8	8	8	13
France	9	6	5	4	4
Italy	4	5	4	2	2
Switzerland	3	2	3	3	4
Belgium	3	0	0	2	2
Netherlands	2	1	1	2	1
Austria	1	2	3	2	3
Japan	1	1	2	1	1
Egypt	1	1	0	0	0
Argentina	1	0	0	0	0
Israel	1	0	0	0	0
Venezuela	1	0	0	0	0
Russia	0	1	1	1	1
South Korea	0	1	1	1	0
Greece	0	1	1	1	1
South Africa	0	0	1	1	1
Canada	0	1	1	3	2
Iran	0	0	1	1	1
Mexico	0	0	1	1	1
Iceland	0	0	1	0	0
Yugoslavia/Serbia	0	1	1	1	1
Denmark	0	1	1	1	2
Australia	0	0	1	0	0
Thailand	0	0	1	1	1
Cuba	0	0	1	1	0
India	0	0	0	0	1

diagram 2

evolution of the shares of countries in the kunstkompass

Country	1995	1998	2000	2003	2005	2008	2010
United States	42.0	42.0	34.2	32.2	32.3	28.5	31.2
Germany	28.2	26,1	29.9	28.2	32.2	31.8	31.7
United Kingdom	5.7	7.0	7.5	7.9	7.1	10.5	10.7
France	5.9	4.5	4.3	4.0	3.9	4.5	3.7
Italy	4.6	5.1	3.6	3.7	2.0	2.6	2.0
Austria	1.7	1.9	2.7	2.7	2.0	2.5	2.7
Belgium	0.7	0	0	1.5	1.8	1.8	1.8
Russia	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.2	1.0	1.1
South Korea	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.1	0	0
Greece	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.8	0.8
Switzerland	1.5	2.7	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.8	3.7
Spain	0.8	0.7	0	0	0.7	0.7	0.
Denmark	1.0	1.1	0.8	0.7	1.2	1.4	2.1
Canada	0.9	1.2	1.0	2.1	2.7	2.4	1.7
Japan	0.8	0.7	1.5	2.2	0.7	0.7	0.7
Yugoslavia/Serbia	0.9	1.0	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.8	0.8
Iran	0	0	0.9	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.0
Iceland	0	0	0.9	1.2	0	0	0
Netherlands	0.8	0.7	0.6	1.5	1.5	1.4	0.9
Australia	0	0	0.7	0	0	0	0
Thailand	0	0	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7
Cuba	0	0	0.6	0.8	0.8	0.7	0
South Africa	0	0	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.4
Mexico	0	0.7	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.9
Brazil	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Albania	0	0	0	0	0	0.7	0
India	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.7

diagram 3

contemporary art: the top 10 auction houses in the world 2010/2011

	Auction house	Auction turnover (in million euros)
1	Christie's	234.4
2	Sotheby's	218.9
3	Poly International Auction Co. Ltd.	88.2
4	Philips de Pury & Co	87.9
5	China Guardian Auctions Co. Ltd.	44.2
6	Beijing Hanhai Art Auction Co. Ltd.	17.9
7	Beijing Council International Auction Co. Ltd.	16.0
8	Shanghai Tianheng Auction Co. Ltd.	14.0
9	Ravenel Art Group	12.5
10	Beijing CNTC International Auction Co. Ltd.	10.2

Source: Artprice, 2011

diagram 4

forty-one international contemporary art fairs

Art 39 Basel	CH
Art Basel Miami Beach	US
Art Cologne—Internationaler Kunstmarkt	DE
Arte Fiera di Bologna	IT
ARCO—Feria Internacional de Arte Contemporáneo	ES
Art Chicago	US
The Armory Show	US
MiArt—Fiera internazionale d'arte moderna e contemporanea	IT
Frieze Art Fair	UK
FIAC—Foire Internationale d'Art Contemporain	FR
Artissima—Internazionale d'Arte Contemporanea Torino	IT
Art Forum Berlin	DE
Art Brussels—Contemporary Art Fair	BE
Art Paris	FR
ARTSingapore	SK
SH Contemporary	CH
Art Fair Tokyo	JP
Art Toronto—TIAF Toronto International Art Fair	CA
Art Amsterdam	NL
VIENNAFAIR	AT
Art Palm Beach 3	US
Art Melbourne	AU
Art Taipei	TW
CIGE2008	CH
Art Miami	US
NADA—Art Fair Miami Beach	US
Melbourne Art Fair	AU
SCOPE Basel	CH
Art Rotterdam	NL
FEMACO	MX
artLA	US
Shanghai Art Fair	CH
Arte Lisboa	PT
arteBA—Feria de Galerías de Arte	AR
Art Dubai	UAE
SCOPE New York	US
Outsider Art Fair	US
Art Now	US
Art Moscow—International Art Fair	RU
Art Paris Abu Dhabi	UAE
PrintBasel	CH

Sources: Artprice and Quemin

diagram 5

breakdown of contemporary art fairs by organizing country in 2008

Country	No. of fairs	%
United States	10	24.4%
Switzerland	3	7.3%
Italy	3	7.3%
China	3	7.3%
Germany	2	4.9%
France	2	4.9%
Netherlands	2	4.9%
Australia	2	4.9%
UAE	2	4.9%
United Kingdom	1	2.4%
Belgium	1	2.4%
Austria	1	2.4%
Spain	1	2.4%
Portugal	1	2.4%
Russia	1	2.4%
Canada	1	2.4%
Mexico	1	2.4%
Argentina	1	2.4%
Japan	1	2.4%
Taiwan	1	2.4%
Singapore	1	2.4%
Total	41	100%

Sources: Artprice and Quemin

diagram 6

contemporary art galleries participating in international fairs in 2008

Country	No. of galleries	%
United States	464	20.0%
Germany	262	11.3%
Italy	219	9.4%
France	149	6.4%
Australia	144	6.2%
Japan	113	4.9%
Spain	100	4.3%
United Kingdom	96	4.1%
Netherlands	89	3.8%
Canada	71	3.1%
Switzerland	65	2.8%
China	61	2.6%
Belgium	48	2.1%
Austria	47	2.0%
Taiwan	43	1.9%
South Korea	40	1.7%
Argentina	39	1.7%
Portugal	35	1.5%
Singapore	25	1.1%
Brazil	22	1.0%
Mexico	16	0.7%
Russian Federation	15	0.7%
India	15	0.7%
Denmark	14	0.6%
Israel	8	0.3%
New Zealand	8	0.3%
Sweden	8	0.3%
Poland	7	0.3%
North Korea	7	0.3%
Indonesia	6	0.3%
Greece	6	0.3%
Luxembourg	5	0.2%
Ireland	5	0.2%
Hong Kong	5	0.2%
Hungary	5	0.2%
Finland	4	0.2%
Thailand	4	0.2%
Turkey	3	0.1%
Philippines	3	0.1%
Slovenia	3	0.1%

diagram 7

Country	No. of galleries	%
Colombia	3	0.1%
Vietnam	3	0.1%
Romania	3	0.1%
Norway	3	0.1%
Puerto Rico	3	0.1%
Venezuela	2	0.1%
Chile	2	0.1%
Uruguay	2	0.1%
Peru	2	0.1%
Czech Republic	2	0.1%
Monaco	2	0.1%
Malaysia	2	0.1%
South Africa	2	0.1%
United Arab Emirates	2	0.1%
Costa Rica	1	0.05%
Cuba	1	0.05%
Dominican Republic	1	0.05%
Tunisia	1	0.05%
Iceland	1	0.05%
Latvia	1	0.05%
Lebanon	1	0.05%
Lithuania	1	0.05%
Serbia & Montenegro	1	0.05%
Islamic Republic of Iran	1	0.05%
Total	2322	100%

Breakdown by country of origin.